the new ugar factories of the backward areas?

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Sir, we are assuring to the farmers and not to the sugar factories. We look after the interests of the sugarcane growers and not of the crushers.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Sir, he has not understood my question. Otherwise they will not be able to pay uniform prices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Salve. You have been effectively answered.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Sir, you have bailed him out.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, we have listened to the explanation given by Mr. Makwana regarding the support price and remunerative price. Sir, I do not accept his explanation. The support price is the minimum price so that the farmers do not incure any loss. Remunerative price is the price which includes some element of profit, etc. Therefore, support price and the remunerative price should not be equated. My question to the hon. Minister is whether he agrees that remunerative price for the growers can be ensured only if this particular farmula is accepted by the Government and the Commission in fixing the price of agricultural produce, namely cost of production plus transport cost plus reasonable profit plus risk allowance. Would the Government advise the Commission to fix the prices on the basis of this formula. Sir, part (b) of my question is what is the particular role assigned to the State Governments in the matter of fixing the prices because many State Governments have given their recommendations which are not accepted by the Commission and by the Government. To illustrate my point, I may say that the Govrenment of West Bengal suggested a certain amount as remunerative price for jute. It was not accepted by the Commission nor by the Government. Therefore, what is the exact role assigned to the State Governments in the matter of fixing the prices og agricultural produce. The fact of the matter is that the State Governments are more concerned about it than the Government at the Centre and therefore, I want that this one should be clarified.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Sir, profit and cost, these are two different terms. Price minus cost is what we call profit. And profit is given for the risk that the entrepreneur takes. Profit is because of risk taking quality of the entrepreneur. Therefore he gets the benefits of profit. Now, in case of this while calculating cost we do not include the element of profit. But while declaring the prices we include the element of profit, we include some amount as profit to the cost of production of the farmers. Therefore, profit element is taken into consideration while declaring the prices and, therefore, it is called remunerative price. So far as the second question is concerned, when we receive the report of the Agricultural Prices Commission, it is circulated to the State Governments. We seek their opinion. After taking the opinion of the State Governments into consideration and after taking the report of the C.A.C.P. and the views of the Planning Commission and various Ministries into consideration we fix the prices. In some cases we may have accepted the recommendation of the State Government and in some cases we may not have accepted them also.

Strike by the Junior Engineers of the CPWD

*142. SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:†

SHRI J. P. GOYAL:

Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Junior Engineers of the C.P.W.D. went on strike in Delhi during the month of March in the current month in this year;

(b) if so, what are their demands and the action taken so far by Government thereon;

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Gurudas Das Gupta.

(c) whether it is also a fact that due to that strike the maintenance work in the Government localities in Delhi had stopped and the residents had to face a lot of inconvenience;

(d) if so, what alternative arrangements were made during the period to ensure that essential maintenance work was carried out; and

(e) whether any senior officer of the Ministry of Urban Development visited these localities to find out as to whether the maintenance work was carried out properly and if so, what are the details in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI): (a) No, Sir. The J.E.'s have, however, been on "Work to Rule" agitation since March 1987 in support of their demands;

(b) The main demands of J.E.'s relate to:

(1) Revision of pay scale.

(2) Cadre Review.

(3) Grant of Fixed Travelling Allowance,

(4) Revocation of the decision regarding bifurcation of the cadre of J.E.'s,

(5) Enhancement of special pay to the J.E.'s posted in Planning.

The demands mentioned above are still under consideration.

With your permission, Sir, I may say that in respect of Demand No. (2), the Cabinet has approved our proposal for cadre Review.

(c) There has been some dislocation of work and the residents of the Government quarters and flats have had to face certain amount of inconvenience on account of J.E.'s agitation, despite the best efforts of the C.P.W.D.

(d) No alternative arrangement was considered necessary as J.E.'s were not 'On strike'.

(e) Senior Officers of the Directorate have been keeping close watch on the situation and periodically monitoring the developments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Minister, whenever you have long answers, please put them in the form of a statement.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it seems that the hon. Madam Minister is suffering from forgetfulness because before she became the Minister of this department there was another gentleman who happened to occupy the post. He is no other person than Mr. Abdul Ghafoor and Mr. Abdul Ghafoor had stated before this House on 21-2-1986 in reply to a supplementary and I quote: "I entirely agree with whatever you have said in this House." There has been some delay and I am thankful for this question which has been brought to my notice. I trying to see that this is done as quickly as possible, may not be in two months but may be in four, five or six months." It means, Mr. Ghafoor had categorically assured the House that cadre review will be implemented or executed latest within six months. Now, 14 months have passed and the cadre review has not been executed. We are having a work to rule policy by the Junior Engineers and Madam Minister might be knowing that there has been a strike ballot yesterday all over the country, and in Delhi, 95 per cent of the J.Es have voted for strike. Therefore, the Government is faced with the problem of having a strike all over the country, particularly Delhi. Therefore, in some a situation, I am never satisfied with the so-called decision of the Cabinet or some such thing. I want a categorical assurance on two points. Number one: Why was there a delay? Why was the assurance given by Mr. Ghafoor not executed even in 14 months' time? Why have you created a situation where 'work to rule' is going on and you are facing a strike? Why has there been delay? And Number two: When is that decision, the so-called decision of the Cabinet, going to the materially executed?

SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI: This is not an easy question because it is in-

volved with different Ministries, the Ministry of Personnel, Ministry of Finance, and all other Ministries. Yesterday, the Cabinet approved our proposal and through this proposal, we are going to create 396 posts of A.E. (Civil) and 163 posts of A.E. (Elec).

About the second part, regarding delay, I think there is no delay because this question was asked about the strike of the JEs. We are trying our best. With your permission, I want to give a small background to this problem. In 1973, the Pay Commission in their report recommended identical payscales for Draughtsman Grade I in the C.P.W.D. and the J.Es. At that time, many of the Draughtsmen Grade I in various departments were drawing a higher scale than the one recommended in the Pay Commission's report. So, they have gone to arbitration and after the award of arbitration, they have got a higher pay scale. But this award disturbed the parity of the pay scale of the J.Es and the Draughtsmen. After that, from that very year, the problem is there and keeping in view the genuineness of their problem, we have made a case for the Fourth Pay Commission and we have pleaded that the disparity should be removed. But after the Fourth Pay Commission's report, the disparity was there and the Pay Commission told us that it was not in their jurisdiction and that the evaluation committee can evaluate their work. After that we have set up a committee under the Chairmanship of Controller of Accounts and we have sent their recommendations to the Ministry of Finance. But as you know, after the Commission's report, it is not an easy task to review all these things.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The long reply of the Madam Minister only confirms the dilatory tactics and the callous attitude of the Government towards the genuine demands of the engineers. Sir, my second supplementary question is, as regards the demands, especially the demand about revision of pay scale—they have a number of demands and among those, one demand is revision of pay scale—to remove anomalies, the Department—or the Ministry—of Urban Development had taken a positive and a sympathetic stand, and I am quoting a letter that the Secretary of the Ministry had written to the Secretary of Finance, dated 14th March 1986:

"On 21st February, 1986, the delegation led by Shri P. R. Kumaramangalam, Member of Parliament, met Shrimati Grewal, Secretary to Prime Minister....."

...when I along with the Director-General, CPWD, was also present. During the discussions, Shrimati Grewal felt that there was considerable force in the demands of the Junior Engineers and desired..

she desired–

...hould take up the matter with you.

i.e. with the Secretary, Finance. At the end, the then Secretary of your department, Mr. Ramesh Chandra says—I quote:

"I shall be grateful if the proposal for the revision of pay-scale of Junior Engineers from Rs. 425 to Rs. 700 is accepted."

I put this because...

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your question. You have taken a lot of time.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I am coming to it. I put this because the position of the Government, your department, is sympathetic. I would like to know, if this letter or this position of your department was turned down by the Finance Ministry, what was the reason? Secondly,

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta. Government is one. You cannot say like that. I will not allow.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: In continuation—I beg you, Sir—Since the Prime Minister is in charge of the Finance portfolio now and Shrimati Grewal is still there, will you take up the matter with the Prime Minister and the present Finance Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will put the question on your behalf. Hon. Minister, will you take up the matter again and expedite it. (*Interruption*) She has said 'Yes'.

SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI: Sir, we are pleading the case, as this letter shows. There is no callousness on our part, there is no inefficiency on our part. We are trying our best for the cause of the Junior Engineers. I have already sent to the present Finance Minister the case of the Junior Engineers and it is under consideration.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHITTA BASU: We want you to be a little more sympathetic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Government has been sympathetic. Why are you quarrelling?

SHRI J. P. GOYAL: Sir, I find that part (c) and (d) of the answer given by the hon. Minister are inconsistent. In part (c) of the reply, they have admitted that there has been dislocation of work and the residents of Government quarters and flats have had to face certain amount of inconvenience on account of the Junior Engineers' agitation despite the best efforts by the CPWD. In part (d), it has been stated that no alternative arrangement was considered necessary as the Junior Engineers were not on strike. Sir, this thing has been going on for the last two years. The hon. Minister in her reply says that they cannot help. She says that the Pay Commission has said something, that there is an Evaluation Committee and so on. She says it is very difficult. For how long will it go on? Should they not fix some time-limit? Why do you have so many committees? The other day, we have seen that it takes fifteen days for a file to reach the Prime Minister. I think, in this case, it may take even one year. Then, how are you going to solve the problem. As I said, this has been going on for the last two years. I think, you should fix some time-limit. The residents in the Government quarters are suffering, particularly in Delhi and other places. It is an all-India question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister, you can repeat what you said earlier.

SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI: Sir, there is a difference between 'work-to-rule' and 'strike'. 'Work-to-rule' means, they work between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. If they are not working, we are persuading them to work because they have to work between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. (*Interruptions*) Sir, I have mentioned already. I am not going to hide anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All this is not relevant because the hon. Minister has already said that they are going to create 396 posts of Assistant Engineers (Civil) and 163 posts of Assistant Engineers (Electrical). If you had said this before the decision was taken, it might have been all right.

Now, Prof. Lakshmanna. There is not much in this question. I am going to take up the next question.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what date, on what date the demands were put forward by the Junior Engineers and what has been the time-leg between the date the demands were put forward and the non-fulfilment of it. I would like to know what efforts have been made to meet the demands one by one.

SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI: Sir, I have already said, it is not our fault. The Pay Commission has rejected our proposal. What can we do in such a situation? After the receipt of the report of the Pay Commission, you know better than me how difficult it is, it is not an easy task [illegible] the situation. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are also repeating the same question and the Minister is giving the same answer. Next Question.

*143. [*The questioner (Shrimati Suryakanta Jayawantrao Patil) was absent. For answ*[illegible]

*134. [*The question was raised by Shri Fida Hussain Bin Quasem and Dr. R*[illegible] 34 infra.]